

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action mailed September 19, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-25 were pending, that claims 9-12, 19, 21, 23 and 25 have been withdrawn from consideration, allowed claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22 and 24, and rejected claims 2-6, 13, 16 and 20. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 13, 16 and 20 have been amended, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-25 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20 under 35 USC 101. Claim 20 has been amended and it is submitted it satisfies the statute. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On page 3 of the Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. section 112, paragraph 1 for failure to satisfy the written description requirement. The claims have been amended in view of the Examiner comments and the Examiners attention is requested to figure 2 and the accompanying description for support thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Action, on page 4, the Examiner rejected claim 13 as not supported by the application as filed focusing on whether the application as filed supports binarizing a targeted pixel multiple times if it is determined to be white. The Examiner has requested that we point to specific support for this claim in the application. The support for binarizing a targeted pixel multiple times if it is determined to be white can be found in the specification discussion associated with figure 2 and pages 16-8, particularly page 17, line 25-page 18, line 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Action, on page 4, the Examiner rejected claim 16 over Hongo. On page 2 the Examiner provides comments concerning the basis for the renewed rejection of claim 16. It appears that the Examiner is interpreting the continued binarization of remaining pixels of a 3x3 sub window after a target pixel is binarized as equivalent to the two binarizations recited in claim 16. The binarization of the "multiple-valued image" of the present invention is a binarization that includes the target pixel. That is, the target pixel is binarized twice based on the determination as to "whether a target pixel is a background". Claim 16 has been amended to clarify this. It is submitted that Hongo does not teach or suggest such. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On page 5 the Examiner rejected claim 13 over Katayama. Katayama determines whether a pixel is near an edge, selects a threshold based on the edge detection and then

quantizes the pixel using the threshold. Katayama does not binarize a target pixel twice ("again") as called for in claim 13. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On pages 5 and 6 the Examiner also rejected claim 13 over Imaizumi. In Imaizumi the second binarization is always performed as noted by the Examiner. The Examiner interprets this as binarizing a pixel when it is white. However, there is no determination of or "recognizing whether a target pixel is white" in Imaizumi. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. sections 101 and 112. It is also submitted that claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22 and 24 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/20/06

By: 

Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501